Case5:12-cv-02048-EJD Document24 Filed09/13/12 Page1 of 3

1	Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000) Of Counsel to Prenda Law Inc.		
2			
3	Mill Valley, CA 94941 415-325-5900		
4	blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com		
5	Attorney for Plaintiff		
6			
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8			
9			
10	AF HOLDINGS LLC,	No. 5:12-cv-02048-EJD	
11	Plaintiff, v.	PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT BOTSON'S NOTICE OF	
12	JOHN DOE AND JOHN BOTSON,	SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY	
13			
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	Defendant John Botson filed a notice of supplemental authority in support of his motion to		
17	dismiss. (ECF No. 20.) Defendant Botson attached the decision in AF Holdings v. John Doe & Josh		
18	Hatfield, 12-cv-02049 (N.D. Cal. September 4, 2012) to his notice. (ECF No. 20-1.) Defendant		
19	Botson argues that the attached decision is involves a "functionally identical claim of negligence		
20	against an ISP account-holder." (ECF No. 20.)		
21	Defendant's characterization of Plaintiff's claim is, <i>per se</i> , false. Negligence claims are		
22	highly fact-intensive. <i>Thomas v. Newton Intern. Enterprises</i> , 42 F.3d 1266, 1271 (9th Cir. 1994) ("In		
23	many cases, this fact-intensive question will be inappropriate to decide on summary judgment and		
24	must be left for the jury.") (quoting <i>Kirsch v. Plovidba</i> , 971 F.2d 1026, 1030 (3rd Cir. 1992). Simply		

Indeed, federal courts throughout California have recognized that the negligence claims asserted by Plaintiff in its first amended complaint could survive a motion to dismiss. See e.g.,

because the general factual background involves digital piracy does not mean that the specific

circumstances of a given claim is functionally identical.

25

26

27

28

Case5:12-cv-02048-EJD Document24 Filed09/13/12 Page2 of 3

1	Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. Felix Latimore, et al., No. 11-cv-00040 (S.D. Cal. July 11, 2011),				
2	ECF No. 9 (recommending the granting of a motion for default judgment against a Defendant				
3	accused of negligence); AF Holdings LLC v. John Doe, No. 12-1519 (S.D. Cal. July 12, 2012), ECF				
4	No. 4 at 6 ("Accordingly, Plaintiff's negligence cause of action could withstand a motion to				
5	dismiss.").				
6					
7			Respectfully Submitted,		
8			PRENDA LAW INC.		
9	DATED: September 13, 2012				
10)	/c/ Drott I. Cibbo		
11		3y:	/s/ Brett L. Gibbs		
12			Of Counsel to Prenda Law Inc.		
13			21 Locust Avenue, Suite #1 Mill Valley, CA 94941 blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com		
14			Attorney for Plaintiff		
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	I and the second	2			

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE The undersigned hereby certifies that on September 13, 2012, all individuals of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document using the Court's ECF system. /s/_Brett L. Gibbs, Esq._ Brett L. Gibbs, Esq.